

1 Ann Marie Mortimer (State Bar No. 169077)
2 amortimer@HuntonAK.com
3 Kirk A. Hornbeck (State Bar No. 241708)
4 khornbeck@HuntonAK.com
5 Brandon Marvisi (State Bar No. 329798)
6 bmarvisi@HuntonAK.com
7 **HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP**
8 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000
9 Los Angeles, California 90071-2627
10 Telephone: 213 • 532 • 2000
11 Facsimile: 213 • 532 • 2020

12 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaimant
13 AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, INC.

14 [Additional Counsel on next page]

15 Neil H. O'Donnell (State Bar No. 057928)
16 nodonnell@rjo.com
17 Lauren Kramer Sugeeth (State Bar No. 259821)
18 lsugeeth@rjo.com
19 Amy L. Bomse (State Bar No. 218669)
20 abomse@rjo.com
21 Eleanor M. Ross (pro hac vice)
22 eross@rjo.com
23 **ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL**
24 311 California Street, 10th Fl.
25 San Francisco, California 94104
26 Telephone: 415 • 956 • 2828
27 Facsimile: 415 • 956 • 6457

28 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterclaim-Defendant
1 CGI FEDERAL INC.

Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP
550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000
Los Angeles, California 90071-2627

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 CGI FEDERAL INC., a Delaware Corporation,

14 Case No.: 2:20-CV-01781-JAM-KJN

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.
17 **STIPULATION AND ORDER TO MODIFY**
18 **PRETRIAL DEADLINES**

19 AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, INC., an Ohio
20 Corporation,

21 Defendant

22 AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, INC., an Ohio
23 Corporation,

24 Counterclaimant,

25 v.
26 CGI FEDERAL INC., a Delaware Corporation

27 Counterclaim-Defendant.

28 Complaint Filed: September 3, 2020
FAC Filed: November 18, 2020

1 Robert Dennis Fairbanks, Jr. (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
2 dfairbanks@HuntonAK.com

2 **HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP**

3 Rivertfront Plaza – East Tower, Ste. 200

3 951 E. Byrd Street

4 Richmond, Virginia 23219-4074

5 Telephone: 804 • 788 • 8200

5 Facsimile: 804 • 788 • 8218

6 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaimant

7 AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, INC.

11 Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP
12 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000
13 Los Angeles, California 90071-2627

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant CGI Federal, Inc. (“CGI”), on the one hand, and
2 Defendant and Counterclaimant Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc. (“AR”), on the other hand, by and through
3 their respective counsel of record, hereby enter into the following stipulation and mutually request the
4 Court enter an order, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), in accordance herewith:

5 1. CGI commenced the instant action on September 3, 2020, and filed the operative First
6 Amended Complaint (“FAC”) on November 18, 2020. AR answered the FAC and asserted
7 counterclaims against CGI on December 8, 2020, then filed its First Amended Answer to the FAC and
8 counterclaims on January 11, 2021. CGI answered AR’s counterclaims on December 24, 2020, and
9 filed its First Amended Answer on January 25, 2021.

10 2. On February 17, 2021, the Court issued its initial Pretrial Scheduling Order. On
11 October 20, 2021, pursuant to the parties’ stipulation, the Court issued an order on the parties’
12 Amended Stipulation To Amend Pretrial Scheduling Order (Dkt. #46), which, among other things: (a)
13 set the expert witness disclosure deadline for May 9 2022; (b) set the deadline for the completion of
14 all discovery for July 28, 2022; and (c) set the trial for March 13 2023.

15 3. The parties have diligently discharged their respective discovery obligations, both
16 before and after issuance of the Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order. While a number of discovery
17 disputes remain between them, the parties have continued to engage in meaningful meet and confer
18 efforts in an attempt to resolve those disputes without the need for Court intervention

19 4. To date, as part of discharging their respective discovery obligations:

20 (a) CGI has been diligent with respect to both seeking discovery it requires from
21 AR and its own document collection and production efforts. CGI has diligently propounded written
22 discovery on AR and served six subpoenas on the third parties with potentially relevant information.
23 With respect to its own collection, review and production efforts, CGI collected more than 3.7 million
24 documents from over 50 custodians, and CGI’s internal Sharefile and Privia sites. Through
25 application of search terms and other analytics, CGI identified over 1.3 million documents for potential
26 review. CGI also has established a review team of more than 30 reviewers. CGI already has produced
27 more than 950,000 documents consisting of roughly 6.8 million pages from its own custodians and
28

1 will continue to make substantial productions on a rolling basis in the future. Of those, CGI has
2 produced approximately 870,000 documents and 6.5 million pages since the Court issued its Amended
3 Pretrial Scheduling Order on October 20, 2021. In addition to its document production, CGI has
4 provided AR with 37 pages of material in its initial response to AR's first set interrogatories, 32 pages
5 in its amended responses to AR's first set of interrogatories, and 9 pages of material in response to
6 AR's second set of interrogatories. CGI has also responded to 17 requests for admission.

7 (b) AR initially collected nearly 2.4 million documents from an initial list of 13 custodians,
8 and its original list of proposed search parameters yielded nearly 550,000 documents for potential
9 review. At CGI's request, AR expanded its custodian list and increased the date range by three
10 additional years, resulting in a new collection universe of 3.4 million documents from 21 custodians.
11 Subsequently, at CGI's request and as a result of the good faith meet and confer process, AR added
12 additional terms to its search terms list, and added three additional custodians (for a total of 24), which
13 increased the volume of documents yielded from the search criteria. At current count, the documents
14 identified by the search criteria, post-deduplication and threading is more than 960,000 documents.

15 To review those documents identified as most likely to be responsive pursuant to the use of an
16 analytics protocol disclosed by AR to CGI, AR has employed a document review team consisting of
17 up to 41 reviewers. Based on that approach, AR already has reviewed over 606,000 documents to
18 date. AR already has produced 227,609 documents and more than 1,416,042 pages from its own
19 custodians' files on a rolling basis (less a small number of privilege clawbacks), with additional
20 productions to occur in the future. Of those, AR has produced approximately 222,478 documents and
21 1,369,425 pages since the Court issued its Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order on October 20, 2021.

22 AR has also conducted targeted searches for invoices and purchase orders/statements of work
23 responsive to requests in CGI's Third Set of Requests for Production of Documents. In addition to
24 AR's document production, AR has provided CGI with 64 pages of material in its initial response to
25 CGI's interrogatories, 57 pages in its supplemental responses to those interrogatories, and given CGI
26 access to nearly 640,000 documents from CGI contractors using AR email accounts.

1 The remaining productions anticipated are limited to additional purchase orders/invoices
 2 responsive to CGI's Third Set of Requests for Production of Documents, and a population of
 3 approximately 24,000 documents initially withheld for privilege, as well as efforts to perform quality
 4 control review and preparation of withheld documents on a privilege log.

5 Given the magnitude of discoverable material, the parties' continued good faith efforts
 6 to conserve judicial resources by attempting to resolve the case, and the parties' continued diligence
 7 in discharging their respective discovery obligations, good cause exists to modify the Amended
 8 Pretrial Scheduling Order to prevent the parties from being unfairly prejudiced absent a continuance
 9 of the existing deadlines in this case. The parties believe their diligence and substantial progress since
 10 the issuance of the Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order justifies the continuance sought herein.

11 **NOW, THEREFORE**, based on the foregoing, and subject to the Court's approval, the parties
 12 stipulate and agree that all existing deadlines should be continued for five months as follows:

Event	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Expert Witness Disclosures	5/9/2022	10/10/22
Rebuttal / Supplemental Expert Disclosures	6/6/2022	11/7/22
Discovery Completion Deadline ¹	7/28/2022	12/9/22
Deadline to meet and confer on whether there will be cross-motions for summary judgment	8/11/2022	12/23/22
Deadline to file dispositive motions	9/12/2022	1/20/23
Hearing on dispositive motions	11/1/2022; 1:30 pm	3/28/23, 1:30 pm
Final Pretrial Conference	2/3/2023, 11:00 am	4/28/23, 11:00 am
Jury/Bench Trial (7-10 days)	3/13/2023; 9:00 am	6/26/23, 9:00 am

26

 27 ¹ In this context, "completion" means that all discovery shall have been conducted so that all
 28 depositions have been taken and any disputes relative to discovery shall have been resolved by appropriate order if necessary and, where discovery has been ordered, the order has been complied with.

1
2 Dated: April 13, 2022
3
4
5

ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL
Neil H. O'Donnell
Lauren Kramer Sujeeth

6 By: *s/ Lauren Kramer Sujeeth*
7 Lauren Kramer Sujeeth
8 (as authorized on April 13, 2022)
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterclaim-Defendant
10 CGI FEDERAL INC.
11
12
13

14 Dated: April 13, 2022
15
16

HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP
Ann Marie Mortimer
Kirk A. Hornbeck
Brandon Marvisi
Robert Dennis Fairbanks, Jr. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

By: */s/ Kirk A. Hornbeck*
Kirk A. Hornbeck
Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaimant
AEROJET ROCKETDYNE, INC.

ATTESTATION

I, Kirk A. Hornbeck, am the ECF user whose ID and password are being used to file this document. In compliance with Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from the other signatory.

Dated: April 13, 2022

/s/ Kirk A. Hornbeck

Kirk A. Hornbeck

Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP
550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000
Los Angeles, California 90071-2627

ORDER

Having reviewed the parties' stipulation, and good cause being shown therefor, the Court hereby ORDERS that the dates set forth in the Court's Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order shall be continued as set forth in the foregoing stipulation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 14, 2022

/s/ John A. Mendez

THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP
550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000
Los Angeles, California 90071-2627